



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ciation, so far won its way among all classes, from the humblest to the highest, as to have arrived at the surprising circulation of more than 12,000 copies.

Deprived of the intolerant powers by which they have so long crushed freedom of thought and religious discussion among their opponents in other countries, the Roman Catholic hierarchy in Ireland are now obliged not only to confine their tyranny within the pale of their own Church, but to abandon as hopeless the attempt either to convince or coerce those of their own flocks, who have the courage to question their authority and set intimidation at defiance. It is, nevertheless, unfortunately too true that the Maynooth priesthood have still under their influence a large number of the bigoted and ignorant class, and that they wield the power which this influence gives them to *intimidate* those who, in a state of real civil and religious freedom, would not hesitate to abandon a creed which their clergy could not defend, but who, in the state of society that unhappily still prevails in Ireland, have not the courage to set at nought the malignity and activity of their priestly tyrants.

We could, if we did not think it indecorous to do so, name not a few intelligent persons who have openly attributed their adoption of the reformed faith to the reasonings of the *LAYMAN*; and a still greater number who have privately admitted their conviction that its arguments were unanswerable, and that they were only deterred from a public avowal of their sentiments, by the fear of injury to their persons or their property, under the instigation of priestly vengeance.

We wish not to urge any one to a public confession until his mind is strengthened and his understanding fully convinced; but we cannot conceal our belief that the time is coming when even the most timid will be emboldened freely to confess their real sentiments, by finding that they have the support and sympathy of numbers similarly situated with themselves. The eye of Omnipotence alone can see the secret state of the hearts and minds of numbers of our fellow-countrymen who at this moment are, or think themselves, compelled by prudential motives to conceal their true sentiments on the subject of religion; or foresee how speedily a revolution of feeling may spring up, and develop itself publicly, in spite of all that priestly tyranny can do to counteract it. We are sanguine enough to believe that the wished for period is not very far off; and when the spring tide comes, woe to them who have done nothing to prepare for or stay the inundation, but use fruitless threats, the impotence of which has been discovered, and which can, therefore, no longer influence any one.

Be the time, however, distant or near, we are resolved to persevere, calmly but steadily, in our endeavours to shed light and circulate information upon the great subjects at stake; and if we are supported by those to whom we already owe so much, we do not despair of advancing the standard of truth into every village and hamlet in the country, or even of convincing some of the higher order of minds among the priesthood themselves, that their real safety in these remarkable times consists in the *enlightenment*, not in the forced *ignorance*, of their people, and that if they would preserve their influence and popularity, it is not by persevering in a fruitless struggle to hoodwink men who are determined to see the light, but by placing themselves at the head of the movement for reformation, and bringing over their congregations with them into a purer atmosphere, where they will be free to worship the God of their fathers after the restored model of the Apostolic times.

## Correspondence.

### INVOCATION OF SAINTS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—Now that I have some leisure to consider your reply to my letter (No. for Aug., 1857, pages 93, 94), I find you begin by affirming, on the infallible authority of mere assertion, that "I have been harping on imaginary inconsistencies in your statements;" but how you have arrived at this summary conclusion, by what species of reasoning, or from what premises, you leave your readers to discover as well as they can. Besides, the fact must still be fresh in the memory of your readers that, in the second and third lines of my letter, I referred to your *five* palpably incorrect and contradictory definitions of the invocation of saints, which still blazon pages 80, 81, of your journal for July, 1857, and which for the wealth of the Rothschilds you cannot reconcile with each other. They must, moreover, be aware that the arguments by which I have established these inconsistent definitions are nothing, more or less, than extracts from your own statements, cited from back numbers, and which, contrary to what you assert, and to save you and your readers the trouble of it, I have *put together*, with the strictest regard both to accuracy and truth, giving your own words just as I found them. Your readers must likewise be sensible that when citing the extracts which thus embody your "*past sentiments*," I called upon you then (No. for July), in the *present tense*, to point out any one of the passages which I cited, or even a single word in any one of them, which I had applied in a sense different from that in which you used it; but this you have not attempted to do, as these incongruous definitions still present the same insuperable difficulty; they are the result of your own statements, and to disprove them you must contradict yourself. Now, as my object is the vindication of truth, and not the defence of any favourite opinion, it cannot, I think, offer any violence to your feelings to repeat my former challenge, not alone with respect to the extracts by which I have established in specific detail your five discordant definitions of this dogma, but likewise to all other references and citations made by me; yet, from my strict adherence to truth on these occasions, I may expect your reply in the *pasto-post-future tense*. You owe it to the cause of truth, you owe it to your Protestant readers, to take up these five notable definitions *seriatim*, and show the fallacy of the arguments by which I have exposed you labouring through such a labyrinth of uncertainties; but this is the very task you endeavour to shun, by crying out that "*I have been harping on imaginary inconsistencies!*" and hence these absurd *definitions* are so many impregnable arguments, on my part, in defence of the question at issue: yes, arguments in which I might challenge Aristotle to pick a hole, and which prove triumphantly that the *inconsistencies* and the *harping* attach to you alone in this case. Admitting you have used *intercessionem* by an inadvertence, it must be looked upon as an *interpolation*, in the manner you have used it, by any one acquainted with the original; besides, you defend the interpolation when you dogmatically "proceed to ask it is pretended that the substitution of the one word for the other makes the slightest possible difference in our argument;" and as "a lover of accuracy" you cling to the quotation which you charge me with "putting into your mouth," and further defend the use of either or of both words at pleasure, and really "magnify the amount of your error," by asserting "that one change was just as important as the other." I can only say of the prayer to the Virgin Mary which you cite, that it is incompatible with our prayer-book practice (No. for June, 1857, page 69). I have never before seen it in the shape in which you give it: thus, you have my answer in the *present tense*. Why do you not give the book and the page from which you cited it?

St. Paul believed the Christians at Rome could, by their prayers, afford him help and assistance in his approaching conflict with the infidel Jews, Acts xxii, 27, 28, &c., and hence he had recourse to their *prayers, help, and assistance*, Rom. xv. 30, 31, 32. He did not believe the Romans could, by any self-inherent and independent power, give him help and assistance "to be delivered from them that do not believe in Judea," &c., &c.; but he believed that they could, by their prayers, procure him this help and assistance from God. The Apostle says, "I beseech you, &c. (καρακαλῶ δε ὑμᾶς), that as fellow soldiers you help me in the contest (αὐτογνωσθαί μοι) with your prayers;" that is, that you procure help for me from God, "that I may be delivered from them that do not believe, &c.; that my service may be accepted of the saints;" and "that I may come to you again, and with you be refreshed;" and with respect to each of these points, he expected their help and assistance. And as St. Paul supplicated the living saints at Rome, so do we pray to the saints *reigning with Christ*, that "for the Lord Jesus Christ's sake, and for the love of the Spirit," they strive together with us in their prayers to God for us; believing that in this way only can they give us help, &c., and not as if they themselves were the authors of the blessings, protection, &c., for which we ask: this is our prayer-book practice, by

which the difficulty, if any such ever existed, between the prayers (*orations*), help, and assistance (*opem, auxilium*) of the saints is removed.

I further observe that, warranted by our prayer-book practice, all our prayers, even our invocations of the saints, are offered up in the name and to the honour and glory of the blessed Trinity—a circumstance to which I wish to direct the special attention of my Protestant brethren, as it explodes your unfounded charges (No. for Aug., page 94), that "Roman Catholics are led to look to the saints as the immediate dispensers of blessings to them;" and that "it matters not how the saints get the blessings to give—it is from them we receive them;" and hence, also, the fallacy of the no less calumnious caricature of our belief and practice (No. for January, 1857, page 3), when the writer asserts that "the popular notion among Roman Catholics is, that the saints intercede with Christ to intercede with God for us;" but, as the prayers of the living saints, joined to those of St. Paul, were the weapons by which he hoped for help in the conflict, so are the prayers of the saints reigning with Christ joined with ours; and in no other way do we invoke them, nor do we otherwise entreat their help and assistance—a fact confirmed by our prayer-book practice.

With respect to my observations on the article in the January number, you say—"On referring back to this article we were surprised to find how completely Mr. Power's arguments had been met by *anticipation*." Yet here again, as well as with regard to my "harping on imaginary inconsistencies," you leave your readers to grope their way in the dark. Now, to afford them (your readers) the necessary assistance, I have to observe that my *arguments*, to which you thus rather enigmatically allude, are the following plain texts of Scripture:—Philip. i. 23; 1. Tim. vi. 15; Apoc. xvii. 14; and Apoc. ii. 10, from which it follows on the evidence of divine truth that Christ reigns "King of Kings and Lord of Lords," and that "His chosen, elect, and faithful" servants go to Him as soon as they are dissolved from this life, and that He then gives them the *crown of life*, and that, therefore, they reign with Him in a state of *eternal happiness*. The incontrovertible conclusions afforded by these texts are, then, my arguments, which you say "*had been met by anticipation*," by which you can only be understood to mean that these texts are not true, and that they are contradicted in the January number. Thus it is you defend the writer of the article in that number when he asserts that "no saint is *now* reigning with Christ." You even defend his *italics*; and, further, when he affirms—"As to the saints who enjoy eternal happiness in heaven, and of whom it is impious to say they do not pray for us, we believe there are no such persons." And again, when he says of the saints departed—"We do not believe that they are in a state of *eternal happiness*; for God's word says no such thing." And still more, you join with this writer when he says of the Scripture—"But if anything at all appears from its statements on the subject, it is that they (the saints departed) are not now reigning with Christ;" and all this he affirms on the supposition that the Scripture does not afford much information respecting the condition of departed souls.

Now, I only ask your impartial and learned Protestant readers to take up their Bible and examine the four texts referred to by me, and compare them with these *assertions*, uttered without a shadow of foundation, and then say whether these texts, or those *assertions*, authenticated only by your *fiat*, are genuine Scripture. Let them do this, and I am confident they will decide that my arguments had not been met by *anticipation* otherwise than by mere *assertion* and sophistry.

This writer next cites Apoc. iii. 21—"To him that overcometh I will give to sit in My throne, as I also overcame and sat down with My Father in His throne;" adding—"this passage is entirely opposed to the Romish view of the matter." Now, the *Romish view of the matter*, as already expressed in the above texts, is that Christ as God reigns and sits on His throne as "King of Kings" (Apoc. xvii. 14, and 1 Tim. vi. 15); and as such, what is to prevent Him from giving "His elect, and chosen, and faithful" servants "who are with Him," and to whom He has pledged himself thus—"Be thou faithful to Me until death, and I will give thee the crown of life" (Apoc. ii. 10)—"that, I say, is to prevent Him from giving them to sit in His throne and to reign with Him? Besides, instead of being opposed to the Romish view of the matter, the passage (Apoc. iii. 21) goes the full length to establish that view and to defend it; for the words—"To him that overcometh will I give to sit in My throne" are explained by Apoc. ii. 10. This passage is the conclusion of the first vision recorded by the evangelist, and by the context evidently intended as a repetition of the exhortation addressed to the angel of the Church of Smyrna. Moreover, as Christ when He overcame—that is, at His death, or, rather, His ascension—sat down with His Father, &c.; and as He has bound Himself by promise, saying, "To him that overcometh"—that is, to him "who is faithful until death" (for beyond this there can be no test of man's fidelity)—will I give to sit in My throne," it follows, incontrovertibly, that He will give His saints to sit with Him in His throne immediately after they shall have overcome—

that is, immediately after death, beyond which period no one can overcome. This writer next cites Matt. xix. 28, and xxv. 31, 34 (passages which have as much relation to anything else as they have to the invocation of saints); and hence the chimera quality of his inferences—namely, “The people of Jesus shall hereafter reign with Him. He is not even Himself reigning now—He does not reign—His kingdom is yet; and we daily pray for its glorious advent—‘Thy kingdom come.’” With respect to this last statement, I have already (No. for August, 1857, page 93) noticed his anti-Scriptural interpretation of the text (Matt. vi. 9, 10), which would shame the merest tyro in Biblical criticism, and which, as I then remarked, proves the case against him, and overthrows all his arguments by exposing their sophistry, when, in contradiction both to the literal, obvious meaning of our Lord’s words as well as to grammatical consistency, he maintains that the passage “Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name; Thy kingdom come,” must be understood to mean—“Our Father, &c. My kingdom come;” thus by a desperate adventure to support the conclusions already noticed.

In support of all his irrelevancies, his blundering interpretations of Scripture, and his groundless assertions, you come forward armed *cap-a-pie* with Matt. xxv. 34; but as this text relates solely to the condition of the blessed after the resurrection, it cannot, therefore, apply to the question as to their present condition; and the only inference which the passage affords with respect to the question at issue is, the day of final retribution is still future; therefore the saints departed are not now reigning with Christ—a conclusion which does not amount in substance even to a “logical cobweb.”

I began by showing that it cannot appear that I have been harping on imaginary inconsistencies until you shall first have proved that I have been guilty of inaccuracy in citing your *past sentiments*, which, for the reasons there stated, I think you will find too difficult a task. I next showed that our invoking the saints in heaven to pray for us is precisely in accordance with St. Paul’s invoking the living saints at Rome to pray for him: the same difficulty, the same diversity of ideas which so much startles you, as suggested by the *orationes* and the *open auxiliumque* of Trent, is plainly observable in the prayers, help, and assistance which the Apostle expected from the Romans, and as inseparable from them. The only difference between our doctrine and practice and those of St. Paul is, that he invoked the saints living at Rome, and we, besides invoking our fellow brethren, invoke the saints in heaven, to “pray for us;” but whether we desire the prayers of the saints on earth or of the saints in heaven, or of both conjointly, our practice is still in accordance with St. Paul: we invoke them “for the Lord Jesus Christ’s sake, and for the love of the Spirit,” &c., &c., to “pray for us.” We do not invoke them as gods, or the authors of the blessings which we seek; nor do we, when we invoke the saints in heaven, cease to pray to God, and neglect the mediatorialship of Christ; neither do we ask them to usurp this mediation of Christ, but to unite their prayers with ours, and to offer them to God through this same mediation—a fact established beyond the reach of doubt or cavil by our *prayer-book practices*. Hence, I have proved we can be in no more danger of mistaking the saints for God and Christ, or of looking upon the *almo-sier* to be the benefactor, than St. Paul was; nor does it seem probable that we can, while we lawfully invoke the living saints after the manner of St. Paul, adopt a different practice and a contrary doctrine when we invoke the saints in heaven—invoking both at the same time, as is our practice. I have given sufficient to show that your speculative views (for such they must be considered) fail to afford even one true glimpse of our doctrine, and that your specimen of a prayer to the Virgin Mary is sadly and radically incorrect, either in excess or omission. The arguments adduced from Scripture by the writer in the January number, as also your contingent, have been fairly disposed of, by showing that some of them are decidedly against you, and had to be put on the tenters to force them to speak a language foreign to their nature and connection; that others of them are applicable only to the *far future*, the condition of the saints after the resurrection; while those texts which relate to their condition immediately after death—such as those cited by me, and which might be multiplied to a much greater amount, and which prove that they are *crowned with eternal life*, and that they *reign with Christ*—are all passed by in silence. I have fairly shown that in the whole of your reply to my letter (No. for August, 1857, p. 93) you have not answered a single argument of mine, either by “anticipation” or otherwise.

I might now close with respect to the article in the January number, were it not necessary to notice that writer’s attempt, by an exposition, in his usual way, of Exod. iii. 2, &c., to ignore the *invocation of angels*; but here, too, Scripture opposes him, and defeats the attempt. “St. Stephen, a man full of faith and of the Holy Ghost” (Acts vi. 5), recapitulates briefly the events of the Church from Abraham downwards, when giving testimony of Jesus before the council at Jerusalem; and of Moses he says (Acts vii. 30), There appeared to him in the wilderness of Mount Sina “an angel of the Lord;”

then, the appearance Moses saw was—“an angel of the Lord;” and, *verses* 35, “This Moses whom they refused, &c., the same did God send a ruler and deliverer by the hand of the angel which appeared to him in the bush.” Hence, we see that during the lifetime of Moses (for so long was he ruler of the Israelites) did this angel still continue to conduct him by the hand, and, therefore, “Moses was in the Church in the wilderness” with this angel which led him by the hand—that is, “with the angel which spake to him in Mount Sina” (*verse* 38). And so far, then, we have the testimony both of St. Stephen and of St. Luke, that Moses saw an angel of God—not God Himself—at the bush; that this same angel led Moses by the hand, spoke to him in mount Sina, and was with him in the Church in the wilderness; and, further, they witness of Moses, whom they thus show to be under the special guidance of this angel, saying—“This is that Moses who said unto the children of Israel: A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren like unto me, Him shall ye hear” (*verse* 37): thus plainly distinguishing between the angel which Moses saw, &c., and the *prophet* which he foretold. Moses does not say the Lord shall raise up this angel whom I saw: no, he does not; but a prophet—“*The Just One* of whom,” reproachingly St. Stephen tells them, “ye have been the betrayers and the murderers” (*verse* 52); you “who have received the law by the disposition of angels” (*verse* 53)—not by the Davar, or personal Word of God—a fact corroborated by St. Paul (Gal. iii. 19), when he affirms, “The law was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator:” so that we have the united testimony of these three inspired witnesses that an angel, in the name, and person, and with the authority of God deputed to him, and who, therefore, spoke as if he were God (Exod. xx. 2, &c.), delivered the law to Moses; which angel, St. Paul proves in the text just cited (Gal. iii. 19), was not the “seed” that “should come to whom the promise was made.” And in the Epistle to the Hebrews, ii. 2, 3, he makes a most pointed distinction between “*the word spoken by angels*,” the old Law given by angels on Mount Sina, and confirmed by God with thunder and lightnings, &c. (Exod. xix), and the Gospel—the “great salvation—which at first began to be spoken by the Lord” (Jesus)—thus affording an inevitable proof that even in this case the word angel is to be understood in its usual acceptation—a created spirit—the messenger of the Lord; and as we have already seen (Acts vii. 38) “Moses was in the Church in the wilderness with the angel which spake to him in Mount Sina,” which angel was, therefore, the same by which God did send him to be a ruler and a deliver, &c., and, consequently, “the angel which appeared to him in the bush” (*verse* 33).

St. Augustine vindicates the belief of the early Church with respect to Exod. iii. 2, &c., affirming “that by an angel God said to Moses, I AM THAT I AM” (Exod. iii. 14), when He sent him to the children of Israel—“quod per angelum dixit Deus, quando Moysen mittebat ad filios Israel; Eco sum, qui sum. (*De Civit. Dei.* lib. xii. cap. 2); and this angel, too, he shows to be a created being. The exposition of “the angel of the Lord” given in the January number will not apply either to Gen. xxviii. 12, or Gen. xxxii. 1, or to many other passages which I might instance; and that it fails, too, with respect to Gen. xxxii. 24, 25, 26, we are assured on the authority of an inspired commentator, the Prophet Hosea (xii. 3, 4), who says of Jacob—“By his strength he had power with God” (*verse* 3); that is, by faith and prayer he derived strength from heaven, and by that strength he “had power over the angel and prevailed.” And the prophet adds—“He (Jacob) wept, and made supplication unto him” (the angel, *verse* 4) for the blessing which he sought (Gen. xxxii. 26), where God and the angel are put in unmistakeable *antithesis* by the Prophet Hosea, plainly showing that the angel was not God, but a created angel. In this instance, too, the evidence of St. Augustine as to the belief of the early Church is quite conclusive. Treating of the change of name from Jacob to Israel, he observes—“This name was given to him by the angel that wrestled with him as he was on his journey returning from Mesopotamia, and which angel was evidently a type of Christ,” &c., &c.—*Hoc autem nomen illi ab angelo impositum est, qui cum illo in itinere de Mesopotamia redeunte iulatus tyrum Christi evidenter gerens*,” &c. (*De Civit. Dei.* lib. xvi. cap. 39). We have just seen one instance of Jacob invoking an angel to bless himself; and again (Gen. xlvi. 16) he invokes an angel to bless the two sons of Joseph—“The good angel which redeemed me from all evil bless the lads,” &c., which is, doubtless, the same angel he had already invoked and supplicated with weeping for the blessing. St. Paul makes mention of this blessing (Heb. xi. 21), and thereby sanctions not alone this instance of the invocation of angels, but also the former explained by the Prophet Hosea, by which he even engrafts the practice on the Gospel dispensation. This same Apostle establishes by a practical example (1 Tim. v. 21) the lawfulness of calling upon angels, or of appealing to them, at least, as witnesses, when he says—“I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect angels,” &c.; for here there can be no question of the propriety of calling on God, and the Lord Jesus, and of appealing to them; and as St. Paul has made the *elect angels* joint witnesses with God and the Lord Jesus

of his charge to Timothy, and as the very condition of a witness justifies an appeal to him, and not only so, but demands it if necessary; and as St. Paul by his example justifies the fact, it follows inevitably that we may, without either offering insult to God or dishonouring the mediatorialship of Christ, call upon the *elect angels*, as he has done. So far, then, from the invocation of angels having no sanction in the Old Testament, we find it fully recognized by St. Paul, and incorporated into the New Testament, of which from the same Apostle we have another conclusive proof (Heb. xiii. 2), where, in reference to Abraham (*Gen. xviii. 2, 3*), and to Lot (*Gen. xix. 1, 2, 3*), he tells them—“Be not forgetful to entertain strangers; for thereby some have entertained angels unawares;” thus, again, not alone confounding the interpretation of Exod. iii. 2 by the writer of the article in the January number, by showing that in this case the *three men* (*Gen. xviii. 2*) and the two angels (*Gen. xix. 1*) were created angels, but also, by his sanction of two illustrious examples of the invocation of angels, as it is indisputable from the passages that both Abraham and Lot invoked these angels, and bowed themselves before them, or worshipped them. Here, too, St. Augustine elucidates the belief of the early Church with respect to these two passages, to which he devotes the whole of the *twenty-ninth chapter of the sixteenth book*, *De Civit. Dei*, which begins—“Item Deus apparuit Abraham ad quercum Mambræ in tribus viris, quos dubitandum non est angelos fuisse”—God also appeared to Abraham at the oak of Mambræ, in three men, who, no doubt, were angels, &c. This Father, by means of the last cited text, confutes the opinions of those who, both before and in his times, impugned, as you do, the invocation of both angels and saints, and who drew their arguments from these very passages, affirming (as you and the writer in the January number from Exod. iii. 2 do) that Christ, even before He took flesh for a perpetuity, often manifested Himself in the office of mediator, and that on this occasion He was one of the three angels which appeared to Abraham. He then shows the groundless character of their arguments, supported only by a forced and unreasonable interpretation of Scripture, and vindicates the practice of the Church in the invocation of angels by showing “that these *three men* were angels, not on the authority of the book of Genesis alone, in which (as he observes) these facts are related, but also on the authority of St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans.” I have other proofs in the New Testament of the invocation of angels being the doctrine of Christ and of His Apostles; but as I have already exceeded my desirable limits, I must forego their consideration at present; yet I have given quite sufficient to prove that such is the case.

I am, sir, yours, &c.,

EDMOND POWER.

We have again, at very considerable inconvenience, made room for one of Mr. Power’s long letters. We should deal rather unceremoniously with a Protestant correspondent who should make equal demands on our space; but in the case of one of the few Roman Catholics who come forward to defend the doctrines of their Church in our pages we are anxious to hear all that he has to say, even though we have received letters from some of our readers complaining of so much of our pages being swamped with matter which they do not find at all interesting. As Mr. Power himself, however, seems not to know how to comply with our repeated requests to him to make his letters shorter, we would point out to him that the cause of his lengthiness is the space which in each letter he thinks it necessary to occupy with recapitulations and repetitions of his former letters, with verbal criticisms on our replies, and with glorifications on the victories he has obtained over us. And we would suggest that he should in future make each of his letters complete in itself and capable of being understood, without referring back to our last ten or twelve numbers. We shall then accompany each letter with as good an answer as we can give, and our readers then must be allowed to judge whether our reply is satisfactory or not, without having the same dish hashed up for their next month’s entertainment. A victory is not worth much if the bystanders cannot discover it unless the conqueror blows his own trumpet vigorously; and a dispute becomes wearisome when the parties can say nothing but repeat over and over again what they have said already.

Mr. Power thinks it an essential part of every letter to descant upon the inconsistencies in our accounts of the doctrine of the Church of Rome. Five was the number which he last counted, but, like Falstaff’s men in buckram, they increase every time he tells the story. We suppose he thinks that if he says it often enough his readers will believe at last that there must be something in it. We can only say, that after reading diligently all that Mr. Power has written, we cannot find the least variation in our accounts of the doctrine of the Church of Rome, nor have we learned anything new about it from all that he has written. We said that the Church of Rome used prayer to God, and we said that she invokes the Virgin and the saints besides. We said that she acknowledges Christ as a mediator, but that she employs, in addition, the mediation of the Virgin and the saints; nay, that she represents these last as mediators between us and Christ, just in the same way as Christ is our mediator with the Father. We said that she taught her people to be more ready to approach to these human

mediators of her own devising than to come directly to the sole mediator whom God has appointed. And we showed that her people being taught to look to the Virgin and the saints as the channels through which blessings are asked and obtained, are not prevented from looking to them directly for help, even though they know that the power to help is not self-derived, but is God's gift; just as the poor persons relieved by some nobleman's chaplain, even though they know that the money dispensed to them is not the almoner's own, still feel that the almoner is the person whose favour they are to conciliate and whose interest they are to obtain. We care not whether Mr. Power finds in these statements six or sixteen inconsistencies; for if truth, and not victory, is his object, his course is plain. If we do not state the doctrine of the Church of Rome to his satisfaction, why does not he state it correctly himself and make an end of it?

Mr. Power has certainly not been fortunate hitherto in his attempts at stating the doctrines of his Church. In his anxiety to pare them of everything offensive, and to put them in a form not open to Protestant objections, he has reduced himself to the necessity of abandoning as indefensible what is sanctioned by the highest authority in his Church. Like the Trojans described by Virgil, in his hurry to shut the gates of his fortress, in order to keep the enemy out, he has shut half his own friends outside, and abandoned them undefended to the mercy of the foe.

When Mr. Power insisted that Roman Catholics never did more than ask saints to pray for them, we quoted the following prayer, and asked him if he approved of it—

"Oh, most sweet Virgin Mary, Mother of God and our Lord Jesus Christ, *refuge of sinners and mother of mercy*, I commit myself this day and evermore to thy protection, with most humble devotion. Place me near unto thee, and *protect me from all my enemies, visible and invisible*. Say unto my soul, I am thy salvation. Direct me, thy servant, in all my ways and actions. Consol me in all my griefs and afflictions. Defend and preserve me from all evils and dangers. Turn thy face unto me when the end of my life shall come; and may thy consolation in that tremendous hour rejoice my spirit. Thou canst do all that thou wilt in heaven and earth, nor can any resist thy will; for thou obtainest from the Almighty whatever thou seekst. Hear, therefore, and receive my prayers, and despise me not when I confide in thy mercy. Behold, I fall down before thee, most gracious Virgin; I fall down and worship in thee thy Son, and I implore thy suffrages to obtain that my sins may be blotted out; and reconcile the heart of thy Son to my heart, that He may possess me, and make me a man according unto His heart."

This prayer, which asks directly for protection and preservation from danger, guidance and direction in difficulties, and consolation in affliction, goes pretty far beyond the "ora pro nobis;" and we asked Mr. Power to say whether he approved of this prayer or not. At length, after much delay and hesitation, the answer has come that this prayer is incompatible with his prayer-book practice. We rejoice that Mr. Power disapproves of a prayer which so plainly offers to a creature worship due to God alone. But when he tells us that it is incompatible with the practice of the Church of Rome we must beg leave to differ with him, as we must regard the author of that prayer (Cardinal Bona, a cardinal of noted learning and piety) as a much more trustworthy authority for the doctrine and practice of the Church of Rome than Mr. Edmond Power. We may add, too, that when a similar choice was forced on Cardinal Wiseman he preferred to undertake the defence of this very prayer, rather than abandon so high an authority as Cardinal Bona. In fact, what security could be afforded by the infallibility of the Church if it be owned that devotional works, circulated under the authority that ranks next to that of the Pope himself, put into the mouths of those who adopt them, language absolutely idolatrous. We repeat it, Mr. Power is right to condemn this prayer, but then he condemns his own Church as well.

Mr. Power tells us next, for the tenth time, that St. Paul asked the prayers of his fellow-Christians. We answer, for the tenth time, that there is nothing objectionable in asking Christians to approach the Throne of Grace with us: what is objectionable is asking them to go to God for us. St. Paul did not regard those whose intercession he invoked as more favoured by God than himself, and likely to have their prayers heard when his would be rejected. He was in no danger of being led, by invoking them, to imagine "they could do all that they will in heaven and in earth, and that none could resist their will"; he was in no danger of asking them to "protect him from all his enemies, visible and invisible;" or begging of them to "say unto his soul, I am thy salvation."

Mr. Power next assails a writer in our January number; but, as far as we can see, without shaking his position in the slightest. In opposition to the decree of the Council of Trent, which grounds the propriety of invoking the saints on the fact that the saints are "now reigning with Christ," our contributor said—

We believe that all Christ's faithful people possess eternal life even on earth; that they enjoy it more fully when they depart this world; that they are then in "joy and felicity;" that they are "with Christ" in a higher

sense than when on earth; but that they are not now reigning with Christ, nor enjoying that measure of full and everlasting blessedness which will be their portion after the resurrection. And in proof of his position that the "reigning" of the saints does not commence till the judgment, our contributor quoted Matt. xxv.—"When the Son of Man shall come in His glory, and all His holy angels with Him, then shall He sit on the throne of His glory: then shall the King say to them on His right hand, come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world."

Mr. Power answers the latter text by saying that it relates to the far future and to the condition of the blessed after the resurrection, which was precisely what our contributor had asserted—namely, that it was *then*, not *now*, that the inheriting of the kingdom was to take place.

Mr. Power quotes other texts, which prove no more than what our contributor commenced by acknowledging—namely, that the departed faithful are "with Christ;" are in a condition of happiness (though they do not attain their full happiness till the reunion of soul and body); that a kingdom is promised them, though they are not yet put in possession of it, and so forth.

One thing is evidently plain from this controversy—namely, that the Scripture contains too little information as to the state of separate spirits, and their employment before the resurrection, to make it safe to found on a theory respecting these subjects a new, non-scriptural system of mediation with God.

We have not space to enter into the latter part of Mr. Power's letter, nor need we do so, since the passages which he brings forward are discussed in the article, p. 136, on the Invocation of Angels, received from the same contributor to whom we are indebted for the article on the Invocation of Saints.

#### THE RELIGION OF SIAM.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR.—We read in the book of Ecclesiastes that Solomon long since declared, that "the thing which hath been, it is that which shall be; and that which is done is that which shall be done; and there is no new thing under the sun." The Church of Rome, greatly as she prides herself on her wisdom and infallibility, affords in her religious system numerous examples of the truth of the saying of the wise king of Israel. Many years ago, the learned Dr. Conyers Middleton published a book to prove that prayers to saints and various other rites practised by modern Roman Catholics were copied from the usages of hero worship that prevailed among their pagan forefathers. Every one has heard of the old bronze statue of Jupiter, which is placed on a pedestal close to the high altar of St. Peter's at Rome, under the very eyes of the Pope. This statue, indeed, has now a new name; it is called a statue of St. Peter, and its great toe is reverently kissed by the modern Romans, with much apparent devotion. I can speak from experience in this matter, having seen the statue myself, and having (like the crowd around me) rubbed my lips against the great black toe, which is now nearly worn away from the constant kissing of the multitude; but while I (foolishly perhaps) imitated their example, I could not help reflecting on the strange freak of fortune which had converted a pagan idol into the image of a Christian apostle.

The object of my present letter is to bring under the notice of the numerous readers of your valuable paper another example, which I lately met with, of the close resemblance (amounting, in some particulars, to exact agreement) which exists between the religious usages of the Church of Rome and those of pagan idolaters. I think that few things are more likely to startle pious and serious-minded Roman Catholics, and to awaken in their minds a spirit of inquiry, than to find how much of their religion is identical with heathen practices; for it is obvious that the natural conclusion from such a fact is this: that these things most probably derived their origin, not from the teaching of Christ and his apostles, but from the craft and inventions of men. The example to which I refer is to be found among the Siamese. An old author who wrote in the beginning of last century, Jeremy Collier, in the second volume of his Historical Dictionary (London, 1701), makes the following remarks on the customs of this singular people:

"Their religion cannot be known but from their books, writ in the *Balic* language, which with them is the tongue of the learned, and very few amongst them do understand; and besides, neither do these books always agree together, which makes the search into those points the more difficult."

If for the word *Balic* in this passage, we substitute the word *Latin*, have we not here an exact description of the practice of the modern Church of Rome? One would think that our author, when he wrote this passage, had the Missal and Breviary before him; or that he had just risen from a painful and fruitless search into the real meaning of some disputed dogma of Romanism, among the writings of her discordant Cardinals and divines—a fact of which you, Mr. Editor, have given so many proofs in your pages.

Collier then goes on to describe the religious teachers of the Siamese, as follows:

"The *Talapains*, who are the priests and teachers of

the Siamese, are looked upon as those who live up to the pattern their God has set them. They have little or no commerce with the world; they never salute any layman, no, not the king himself. They live very austere and abstemiously; they obey one head, who is the priest of the great Pagoda of Siam, the capital of the kingdom. They are clothed in yellow linen, and have their heads shorn; they are under a vow of chastity as long as they are priests. . . . There are also a sort of female religious, or nuns. . . . They observe a sort of lent, which lasts three months, during which they abstain from several sorts of food. They pray for the dead, and bury them with abundance of ceremony; for, besides music, without which no considerable persons are ever buried, their funerals are often accompanied with stage-representations, and fireworks."

Almost every feature in this curious passage is applicable to the modern priests of Rome. The sanctity and superiority which they claim for themselves beyond all the rest of mankind—their union under the Pope as a common head—their fasts and vows of chastity, and conventional establishments—these, and other particulars, are plainly common to the two systems. A Carthusian monk, with his loose yellow robe and shaven head (such as I have often seen in Italy), if he happen to meet with a *Talapain*, might, so far as external appearance is concerned, almost look upon him as a brother.

Again, we find that prayers for the dead form part of the religious system of the *Talapain* priests. Now, it has often been urged that the Church of Rome borrowed the custom of praying for the dead from the rites of the ancient heathen, among whom we know that this practice prevailed; and it is certainly a curious circumstance to find the same practice prevalent in the remote regions of the Eastern world. In fact, the Church of the Siamese, if addressing the Church of Rome, might parody Shakespeare's amusing description of sympathetic resemblance: "You are not young; no more am I; go to, then, there's sympathy. You are merry; so am I: ha! ha! then there's more sympathy. You love sack, and so do I: would you desire better sympathy?" The conclusion is the same, but it has a far more plausible foundation to rest on.

I will not exhaust your patience by quoting at length the account given by Collier of the central temple, or pagoda, at Siam, with its great golden statue, and its high altar, with four golden figures resting on it, each about the height of a man, and richly adorned with precious stones. I will merely add, that the description would suit, in many points, the interior of some Roman Catholic churches; but whether it accords with the purity and simplicity of Christian worship, as set before us in the New Testament, I will leave your readers to consider.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

VIATOR.

#### FAIR PLAY, AND OLD IRELAND FOR EVER.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

MR. EDITOR.—The last night we met for discussion the Reader says to Andy, "As we're still upon the rule of faith, I hope you've brought some explanation of that queer mistake in the Douay that we were speaking about." "What mistake?" says Andy. "Translating the same Greek word *mystery* in 26 places, and *sacrament* in the 27th," says the Reader. "Twas no mistake at all," says Andy. "I believe you, my boy," says the Reader; "twas on purpose ye did it. But what I want to know is, what authority ye had for doing it?" "We'll see about that some other time," says Andy. "You're so long seeing about it," says the Reader, "that I'm afraid it's out of sight by this." "Well," says Andy, "to tell the honest truth, I looked out in a lot of our books, but I couldn't find any explanation of it." "So I thought," says the Reader; "and I'm thinking, boys," says he, "that you'll have to take the explanation I gave you, for want of a better; but I'll leave it to yourselves whether that kind of work is fair play." "Arra go easy," says Andy; "sure that's only a single error, and any Bible might have that." Well," says the Reader, "here's the twin brother of it, and see if that will please you. There's Greek word that occurs 58 times in the New Testament, and we always translate it *repent* or *repentance*, but you translate it *do penance*." "To be sure we do," says Andy, "and we're right; for it stands to reason that our infallible Church must know best." "Isn't it a queer thing, then," says the Reader, "that your infallible Church in some places translates it *repentance*, just as we do?" "I deny that," says Andy. "We always translate it *penance*. There's the Douay, and show me, if you're able, a single instance in which it's translated *repentance*." "Look out for Mat. iii. 2," says the Reader. "Here it is," says Andy. "Isn't it translated *repent* there?" says the Reader. "No," says Andy; "but the good old word, *do penance*." Well, the boys gave a cheer for Andy that almost riz the thatch off the roof. "Try it again, my buck," says Andy; "maybe you'll have better luck next time." "Well," says the Reader, "look at Mark i. 4." "Here it is," says Andy, "and there's not a word about *repentance*; it's *penance* still." So the boys were in great delight, and Andy was fairly the cock of the walk.

\* This occurred to a Reader, and occasioned much merriment.